

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed March 27, 2007, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. To further the prosecution of this application, amendments have been made in the claims, and each of the rejections set forth in the Office Action has been carefully considered and is addressed below. The claims as presented are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-54 were previously pending in this application. Claims 1-3, 18-29, 35-37 and 52-54 are amended herein. Claims 55-69 are added. No claims are cancelled. As a result, claims 1-69 are pending for examination, with claims 1, 18, 35 and 52-54 being independent. No new matter has been added.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as purportedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,122,635 to Burakoff et al. ("Burakoff"). Burakoff is commonly assigned with the present application, and Applicants are well aware of the system described by Burakoff. As amended herein, claims 1-69 patentably distinguish over Burakoff.

A. Claims 1-12, 55-59

As amended herein, claim 1 recites a computer-implemented method comprising acts of: (A) executing a set of programmed instructions on a source file to identify a source location within the source file, the source location comprising at least a portion of the source file containing a data element; (B) storing an indication of the source location; (C) receiving a request, from a user viewing a file other than the source file, to retrieve the data element at the source location; and (D) employing the indication of the source location to retrieve the data element at the source location.

Support for the amendments to claim 1 provided herein may be found in Applicants' specification at, for example, p.16, line 3 – p.17, line 26.

Burakoff fails to satisfy the totality of limitations recited by amended claim 1. For example, Burakoff fails to disclose or suggest receiving a request, from a user viewing a file